

**From:** drupal\_admin <drupal\_admin@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 06, 2016 1:01 PM  
**To:** HarborComments  
**Subject:** Harbor Comments

Submitted on 09/06/2016 3:01PM

Submitted values are:

Your Name: (b) (6)

Your Email: (b) (6)

Your Comments:

I am a kayaker who uses the river incl the part in the proposed cleanup zone several times a summer. I have chosen not to swim in the river for many years out of concern for toxins. I am not a scientist, much less a very wealthy industrialist who is likely to sway your decisions. Yet I feel strongly that you are not fulfilling the mission you ought to have, that of cleaning up the river. It was intentionally, systematically fouled. You propose to leave essentially all the toxins in place for "natural amelioration." That may work over the centuries; I don't know, and that timeline is not relevant to me or my family. So my single comment is, 'clean up the river, don't rely on nature to do it.'

Perhaps an analogy you can relate to would be if I spilled hundreds of gallons of toxins in your backyard. You would want to hold me responsible.

I'd say, well, I'll bring in a certain number of cubic yards of soil to cover the toxins; over time they will waste away. Would such a proposal be acceptable to you for your own backyard? Or put another way, if I and my friends walked our dogs by your house every day and each time, they defecated in your front yard w/o my or my friends cleaning it up. Left long enough, the feces will disappear; even if we stopped walking the dogs, would you accept a yard full of feces even for a year?

Please ponder these analogies in your final decision.